



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,279	01/29/2001	Toshihiro Shima	Q62411	6249

7590 07/07/2004
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

ARSHAD, UMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

15

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/770,279

Applicant(s)

SHIMA, TOSHIHIRO

Examiner

Umar Arshad

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 5/12/2004.

Claims 1 – 16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 are independent claims. In the amendment claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 were amended and claims 13 – 16 were added.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 – 7, and 9 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zellweger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,230,170.

As per claim 1, Zellweger teaches an information display system comprising:

Art Unit: 2174

means for providing, on a screen of a computer, default sized display areas for a plurality of elements each having detailed information (see Zellweger, figure 11, items 140 – 144);

means for enlarging a corresponding, default sized display area when a user selects an element from said plurality of elements (see Zellweger, figures 11 – 12 and column 11, lines 22 - 29);

means for displaying additional information for said selected element in said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Zellweger, figures 11 – 12 and column 11, lines 22 – 29; it is apparent that the annotation 148 is additional information because it is not displayed on the screen until annotation mark 144 is selected); and

means for also displaying, on said screen, those elements that were not selected so that none of said elements are hidden under said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Zellweger, figure 12).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Zellweger teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zellweger further teaches the information display wherein said means for displaying said unselected elements includes means for reducing sizes of said default sized display areas for said unselected elements and for summarizing contents displayed therein (see Zellweger, figure s 15 – 18 and column 12, lines 39 – 55).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zellweger further teaches the information display system further comprising means for, when one of said plurality of elements is selected, adjusting arrangement on said display screen of said display areas for said plurality of elements (see Zellweger, figures 11 and 12 and column 11, lines 21 – 30).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zellweger further teaches the information display system wherein an element that is related to an objective or the needs of the user is included in said plurality of elements (see Zellweger, figure 18 and column 12, lines 50 - 55).

As per claims 6, 7, 9, and 10, they are of similar scope to claims 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 11, it is of similar scope to claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 12, Zellweger teaches a method of displaying information on a screen of a computer comprising:

displaying on said screen a plurality of elements, each element is displayed in a default sized display area (see Zellweger, figure 11, items 140 – 144);

Art Unit: 2174

enlarging a corresponding, default sized display area when a user selects an element from said plurality of elements (see Zellweger, figures 11 – 12 and column 11, lines 22 - 29);

obtaining from memory sub-elements of said selected element;

displaying said sub-elements for said selected element in said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Zellweger, figures 11 – 12 and column 11, lines 22 – 29; it is inherent that the annotation 148 is retrieved from memory because it is not displayed on the screen until annotation mark 144 is selected); and

displaying, on said screen, unselected elements so that none of said elements are hidden under said enlarged, corresponding display area (see Zellweger, figure 12).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 12 (see rejection above). Zellweger further teaches the method of displaying information on a screen of a computer according to claim 12, wherein when the user selects a sub-element from said sub-elements displaying a subsequent level of information for said selected sub-element in said enlarged corresponding display area so that none of said unselected elements and unselected sub-elements is hidden (see Zellweger, figures 23 and 24 and column 13, lines 8 – 17).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 13 (see rejection above). Zellweger further teaches the method of displaying information on a screen of a computer according to claim 13, wherein said enlarged

Art Unit: 2174

corresponding display area is further enlarged without hiding any of the unselected elements and said unselected sub-elements (see Zellweger, figure 24).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 12 (see rejection above). Zellweger further teaches the method of displaying information on a screen of a computer according to claim 12, further comprising, upon further selection of a different element by said user, enlarging a corresponding display area of said different element and displaying said different element with a sub-element not previously displayed in said corresponding display area, without hiding the previously selected element with said sub-elements and any of said unselected elements (see Zellweger, figures 23 and 24 and column 13, lines 8 – 17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,230,170 in view of Kanevsky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,426,761.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zellweger does not teach further teaches the information display system wherein said means for displaying said unselected elements includes means for adjusting sizes of display areas of said unselected elements to reflect a magnitude of relevancy of said unselected elements to said selected element. Kanevsky teaches further teaches the information display system wherein said means for displaying said unselected elements includes means for adjusting sizes of display areas of said unselected elements to reflect a magnitude of relevancy of said unselected elements to said selected element (see Kanevsky et al., column 4, lines 24 – 30 and column 11, lines 55 – 58; the relevancy of a group of icons determines the spatial clustering of the fractal centralized around an icon). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Kanevsky with the method of Zellweger in order to provide improved access to useful information for a user.

As per claim 8, it is of similar scope to claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zellweger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,230,170 in view of Hoeber et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,230,063.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 12, Zellweger teaches the method of claim 12 (see rejection above). Zellweger does not teach the method of displaying information on a screen of a computer according to claim 12, further comprising piercing a setting pin to a display area corresponding to an element thereby preventing enlargement and reduction of said display area upon further selections.

Hoeber teaches piercing a setting pin to a display area corresponding to an element thereby preventing removing of the display area from the screen upon further selections (see Hoeber, figures 3(a) – 3(c) and column 2, lines 46 – 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hoeber with the method of Zellweger in order to allow retaining of an object on the screen.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2174

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

UA

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100